

Minutes

DWR Fish Facilities Coordination Team

9 am – 12 pm

May 20, 1999

Central District Conference Room

Attendance: Joe Serpa, John Moe (Delta Field Division)
 Kate Le (O&M)
 Mike Ford, Michele Ng, Steve Bradley (Office of SWP Planning)
 Tim Talbert (Central District)
 Curtis Anderson (Northern District)
 Gordon Enas, Shawn Mayr (DOE)
 Steve Ford, Kamyar Guivetchi, John Andrew, Randy Beckwith (ESO)
 Stein Buer, Ron Ott (CALFED)

1. New Northern Intake to Clifton Court

Stein Buer launched the discussion with an overview of recent decisions of the CALFED Policy Group which relate to a new northern intake to CCF. Those decisions indicate support for:

- state-of-the-art screens for the SWP and CVP in the south Delta;
- a 500 cfs test facility at Tracy with a three-year research period;
- a screened facility, of approximately 13,000 cfs at an approach velocity of 0.2 fps, to meet average daily pumping of 10,300 cfs at Banks Pumping Plant;
- study SWP/CVP intake consolidation, which could lead to closing Tracy and expanding CCF intake capacity to approximately 19,000 cfs, to meet average daily pumping of 14,900 cfs; and
- flow control structures in Old River at Tracy, Middle River, and perhaps Grant Line Canal, and the Head of Old River fish control structure.

The regulatory agencies are demanding assurances that all water diverted through a new northern intake will be screened. Construction staging, in 2500 cfs intervals, of the new intake could be one part of the assurances package. However, for at least one component of the facility (i.e. the siphon under Italian Slough), it may be more economical to build a full-sized siphon initially rather than incrementally. The total time for completion of these CALFED elements is 13 years (year 2012).

The preference for a northwest intake to CCF, as opposed to a northeast intake, is based upon:

- better tidal flushing, and thus less possibility for fish entrainment;
- less dredging in Old River;
- local support to avoid impacts to three islands at NE corner of CCF;
- regulatory pressure to avoid wetlands at NE corner; and
- avoids impacts to recreation on Western Canal.

Feedback to CALFED and Office of SWP Planning (the South Delta Improvements program manager) focused primarily on:

- interagency technical team for design process;
- coordination with Tracy Experimental Fish Facility;
- management team structure to integrate Tracy and CCF design processes;
- to low-head pump or not to low-head pump;
- hydraulic control;
- modeling of on-peak vs. off-peak diversions and impacts in the south Delta;
- what do we need to know to build a screen at CCF;
- realistic assumptions in the CALFED timeline, especially with respect to Tracy;
- need to decide early joint or separate SWP/CVP facilities;
- value of Tracy research to a CCF screen, and its impact on the timeline of a CCF facility; and
- de-coupling Tracy and CCF.

Michele Ng described how Planning has modeled a conceptual design: no low-head pumps; 275 ft long V-screens, at a 5 degree angle, at 10 feet of average submergence, and 1 to 1.5 feet of head loss. For 13,000 cfs capacity, 12 such screens would be required.

The discussion concluded when Mike Ford indicated his preference to discuss the matter further with DOE, after which Planning would return to the team in two months with a preliminary design and timeline for further discussion.

2. Proposed Roles and Responsibilities with respect to Fish Facilities at DWR

John Andrew requested that, for discussion at the next meeting, each division or district on the team prepare a one-paragraph statement on the role of its group in fish facilities at DWR.

3. Roaring River Screens

Shawn Mayr presented the findings of his search through DOE personnel and files about the mystery screen at Roaring River. Shawn confirmed that the material used was copper-nickel, but the exact mix of the two metals is unknown.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Andrew